

Remarks

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-21 are pending in the application, with claims 1 and 11 being the independent claims. Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action states on page 3 (section 4) that claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 2004/0143734 A1 to Chiang *et al.* (hereinafter, "Chiang"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites in part :

*wherein the transmit channel of each SERDES lane is phase-locked
with a corresponding receive channel.*

(See, Applicants' claim 1)

The Office Action points to claim 1 of the Chiang to allegedly teach this feature. However, a careful review of Chiang does not support alleged teaching for the reasons discussed below.

Namely, claim 1 of Chiang recites "at least one phase locked loop connected to said decoder/encoder." (See, Chiang, claim 1) This phrase of Chiang's claim 1 is inherently unclear, and therefore needs to be interpreted in light of the specification of Chiang, as required by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit:

"[C]laims must be read in view of the specification, of which they are a part...the specification is always highly relevant to the claim construction analysis. Usually, it is dispositive; it is *the single best guide* to the meaning of a disputed term."

Phillips v AWH Corp. 415 F.3d.1303, 1315 (Fed. Cir, 2005)

Atty. Dkt. No. 1875.5620001

The phase *decoder/encoder* in Chiang is to be interpreted to be decoder that is separate and distinct from the encoder, because this is the only configuration supported by the specification of Chiang. For example, FIG. 2 of Chiang illustrates decoder 24 that is separate and distinct from encoder 26. (*See*, Chiang, FIG. 2) Further, the decoder 24 has a dedicated transmission PLL 241, and the encoder 26 has a two dedicated receive PLLs 261 and 271. It is clear from FIG. 2 that the transmission PLL 241 is *not connected* in any way to the receiver PLLs 261 and 271, as would be required by a phase lock. Further, the RxClock1 from the PLL 261 has no relation to the RxClock2 from the receiver PLL 271, and certainly no connection or relation to TxClock1 and TxClock2 of the transmission PLL 241.

Accordingly, based on the clear reading of the Chiang disclosure, it is apparent that Chiang claim 1 recitation that "at least one phase locked loop connected to said decoder/encoder", is to be interpreted that one or more transmission PLLs are connected to the Decoder, and one or more receiver PLLs are connected to the encoder. However, Chiang provides no connection between the transmission PLL and the receive PLL, and further provides *no indication* that the transmit PLL is phase locked to any of the receiver PLLs. In fact, FIG. 2 of Chiang illustrates that they operate completely independently, and even at different rates. (*See*, Chiang, FIG. 2) Accordingly, Chiang does not teach or suggest the feature that *the transmit channel of each SERDES lane is phase-locked with a corresponding receive channel*, as recited in Applicant's claim 1. Accordingly, Chiang does not disclose each and every feature of Applicants' claim1, and therefore does not anticipate claim1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Chiang for at least the reasons provided above. Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the reasons that claim

1 is patentable, and further for their own respective features. It is further noted that that alleged rejections of claims 3-5 refer to elements 416 and 410, which do not appear in the Chiang patent. Based on the discussion herein, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-5 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Other Matters:

Applicants note with appreciation the allowance claims 11-21 and the allowable subject matter in claims 6-10.

Conclusion

The stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Amirichimeh *et al.*
Appl. No. 10/813,363

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Jeffrey T. Helvey
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,757

Date: 5/29/08

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600
825317_1.DOC